

Equality Impact Assessment Wendover 2022 Parking Review

When completing this Equality Impact Assessment, please refer to the accompanying guidance available on the intranet [here](#). Please be concise, use plain English and note that this document may be available to members of the public.

Part 1: Project details

Project title	Wendover (2022) Parking Review
Is this a new or existing project?	New
Responsible officer	John Pateman
Job title	Design Services Team Leader
Contact phone number	07971 107046
Email	john.pateman@buckinghamshire.gov.uk
Team	Design Services
Service	Highways & Technical Services
Business Unit	
Date started	September 2019 (originally as a feasibility study)
Date completed	Ongoing

Part 2: Purpose and Objectives

2.1	What is the purpose of the project or change?	To implement parking controls as requested by residents and others across the town, and at some locations introduce parking restrictions to support the Highway Code.
2.2	What are the key objectives of the project or change?	To support the Highway Code and for the following statutory reasons:- For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising. For facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians). For preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.
2.3	Which other functions, services or policies may be impacted?	None identified.
2.4	Who are the main stakeholders impacted by this project or change?	Residents, their visitors, businesses and commuters.
2.5	Which other stakeholders may be affected by this project or change?	None identified.

Part 3: Data and Research

3.1	What data and research has been used to inform this assessment?	This assessment has been based on the responses to the statutory consultation and to good practice/experience from previous parking schemes.
3.2	Have any complaints on the grounds of discrimination been made in relation to this project?	There have been two responses referencing AGE & DISABILITY, and a further five responses referencing AGE
3.3	Please provide evidence of these.	Please see Annex on page 5 onwards with extracts from comments.

3.4	What <u>positive</u> impacts have been established through research findings, consultation and data analysis?	<p>The results of the consultation held indicate that where no waiting anytime restrictions are recommended there should be greater egress and access visibility and reduced obstruction. This will improve accessibility on footways (pavements) for wheelchair user and those with mobility difficulties.</p> <p>The only parking proposed to be removed by double yellow lines is places where it is unsafe to park as outlined in the Highway Code. This should make the road safer for all road users regardless of their age.</p>
3.5	What <u>negative</u> impacts have been established through research findings, consultation and data analysis?	None identified from project itself, but this project does not address some of the negative impacts raised in the consultation responses – see Annex on page 5.
3.6	What additional information is needed to fill any gaps in knowledge about the potential impact of the project?	No further information will be required. Monitoring of the proposed restrictions and their impact will be monitored after their implementation (by the parking enforcement team) on a regular basis.

Part 4: Testing the impact

Within this table, please indicate (✓) whether the project will have positive, negative or neutral impacts across the following nine protected factors and provide relevant comments. Both positive and negative impacts should be specified where this applies.

Note 1: Listing a negative outcome does not mean the project cannot continue.

Note 2: This is an opportunity to identify and address issues for improvement

		Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Neutral Impact	What evidence do you have for this?	Improvement Actions Required
--	--	-----------------	-----------------	----------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------

4.1	Age	✓	✓		<p>Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>The statutory consultation indicates that there has been unsafe parking that may effect all road users including this protected group. The double yellow lines will remove a small amount of unsafe parking, i.e. on a junction.</p> <p>The parking review does not address the concerns raised of pavement parking in Vinetrees and Perry Street for accessibility for older people with mobility difficulties/sight impairments.</p>	N/A
4.2	Disability	✓	✓	✓	<p>Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>The statutory consultation indicates that there has been unsafe parking that may effect all road users including this protected group. The double yellow lines will remove a small amount of unsafe parking, i.e. on a junction. It is noted that this project has not gone far enough for some respondents where they wanted double yellow lines to prevent pavement parking in Vinetrees and Perry Street</p>	N/A
4.3	Gender			✓	Statutory Consultation	N/A
4.4	Marriage & Civil Partnership			✓	Statutory Consultation	N/A
4.5	Pregnancy, Maternity & Paternity	✓			<p>Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>The implementation of the proposed waiting restrictions will, in theory, allow a greater ease of passage through many locations for those with pushchairs/children.</p>	N/A
4.6	Race			✓	Statutory Consultation	N/A
4.7	Religion & Belief			✓	Statutory Consultation.	N/A
4.8	Sexual Orientation			✓	Statutory Consultation	N/A

4.9	Transgender			✓	Statutory Consultation	N/A
4.10	Carers*			✓	Statutory Consultation	N/A

**someone who provides unpaid care for a family member or friend who is unable to cope without their support. This may be due to illness, disability, frailty, mental health problems or addiction*

ANNEX – COMMENTS MADE ABOUT GROUPS WITH PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Summary of issue and location	Protected group/s	Extract from response	Officer reply/consideration
Perry Street pavement parking	AGE and DISABLED	I feel it is essential that the No Waiting regulation on this stretch of Perry Street should be 'no waiting at any time'....parking on the pavement is not a solution - it is dangerous. Pavement parking obstructs the walkway and forces disabled-scooter users and people pushing buggies to venture into the road at this point	The no waiting proposals in Perry Street were not supported more widely at this time however it has been recommended that the no waiting at any time proposals be introduced to support the highway code and improve accessibility for disabled and those using buggies. The council is not supporting or endorsing pavement parking. The parking team will monitor the parking situation as part of ongoing enforcement. Any negative impacts on persons with these protected characteristics will remain as we are not addressing the problem highlighted in this review.
Vinetrees pavement parking	AGE and DISABLED	Many elderly residents in this road pavement parking can be a problem when it is obstructing mobility scooters and walking aids	The proposals were for limited waiting in the parking bays within the road and it has not been generally supported. The council is not supporting or endorsing pavement parking. The parking team will monitor the parking situation as part of ongoing enforcement. It is recommended
South Street permit parking	AGE	There are young families on the street have to walk across the road with luggage and children in tow. It would limit the dangers to the children if this was addressed.	There does not appear to be much support for residents permit parking at this time, however the parking is already regulated in South Street to ensure sight lines between pedestrians (including children) and motorists is maintained.

Vinetrees parking availability	AGE	The current restrictions appear to work well and I would retain them.....Most of the residents are over 70 - many over 80, as indeed I am - yet it is proposed that they will need to seek alternative parking - where? It is an utter disgrace that senior citizens - in this area designated specifically for persons above the age of 50.- should not be able to park anywhere near their abode during the day. I seriously hope that more consideration be given to these elderly residents.	There does not appear to be support for the proposal and therefore the recommendation is for the parking control to remain the same. The proposal was to create parking opportunities for residents and their visitors/carers during the curfew hour. It was therefore proposed to improve the situation for all residents including those over 50, 70 or 80 years of age.
Wharf Road	AGE	Excellent proposal and will make the area much safer for the school children who walk and bike to school!	The proposals are for yellow lines to support the Highway Code.
Dobbins Lane	AGE	We own and operate XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX residential home providing elderly care at number XX Dobbins Lane. We usually have sufficient car parking for staff and visitors but as this can change at a moment's notice, parking on the road without restriction is a useful, safe and convenient way to mitigate it. This is especially true when doctors and district nursing staff need to visit. At the far end of Dobbins Lane where we are, it is a no through road and does not suffer with either town or railway user parking. Neither does it have through traffic. As a consequence, a blanket restriction for the whole of the road, albeit for one hour only in the morning, will have a disproportionate effect on the 20 residents for whom we serve.	There does not appear to be support for the proposals and therefore the recommendation is to remove this road from the parking review. Doctors and district nursing staff will be able to park as they do now and so there the impact is expected to be neutral.
Dobbins Lane	AGE	We live at number XX, one of a number of houses at the top end of Dobbins Lane with no driveway or off-street parking. We have three small children and currently park outside our house. If we lose parking rights on our own road then the house becomes pretty much unusable.	There does not appear to be support for the proposals and therefore the recommendation is to remove this road from the parking review. Parking will remain as it does now and therefore the impact is expected to be neutral.